



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

relations which at the close of the war developed between Greene and the civil authorities of South Carolina were most unfortunate and trying for the general.

The author admits that Sumter and his associates were perhaps unduly sensitive. But the great difficulties under which their work was done — with no government to raise troops for them and furnish them with supplies — and the important results which they achieved entitled them to strong feelings of pride. General McCrady's conclusions are based on the letters of Greene, on the correspondence of Sumter, which was published in the *Charleston Year Book* of 1899, but especially on the study of the war map of South Carolina during the Revolution. To the 26 engagements which had been fought by the partizans, or state troops, in 1780 were added 62 engagements in 1781, 45 of which were fought without the aid of the Continentals. By this activity not only were the Tories held in check, but the communications of the British were cut off, serious losses were inflicted upon them, and they were at last forced back to Charleston. Though the author does not deny that the presence of the Continental army was necessary to give consistency to the American system of defense, he claims that the heavier part of the work was done by the partizans. The British were destroyed by slow attrition, the blows being mainly inflicted by the local forces.

The last volume of the work is certainly the most original of the four. The criticism of earlier views which it contains is healthy and valuable. It effectually rehabilitates Sumter and brings him out much more clearly into the light of history. It administers a check to hero-worship by presenting a remarkable picture of the sacrifices which an entire people will make in defense of their homes. But, since history affords comparatively few such spectacles, the judgment of British officers in the earlier colonial period and of Washington during the French War and the Revolution concerning the comparative value of militia and regulars will not be seriously modified.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

The Writings of James Madison. Edited by GAILLARD HUNT. Volume III. 1787. The Journal of the Constitutional Convention, I. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Pp. xxi, 471.)

MR. HUNT's third volume comprises Madison's notes of the debates in the Philadelphia Convention through July 18 ; the fourth will present the remainder, with an index to the two, which are evidently intended to be issued separately, as a work independent of the rest of the series. In one sense, these notes do not form a necessary part of Madison's writings. But on the whole we have nothing else from his pen so important as this record of what he and others said in that memorable gathering, and there is a distinct need of a new edition. Gilpin's is not now easy to procure ; the fifth volume of Elliot, unless one picks up an early issue, is obtainable only in shabby print from worn plates ; the text presented in the

Documentary History of the Constitution, though invaluable for minute researches, is hard for the ordinary student or reader to use ; and the only other edition is made up from Gilpin without conscience or scholarship, and is inappropriately entitled *Journal of the Federal Convention*. It is disquieting to see that Mr. Hunt makes use of the same title. Surely the journal of a deliberative body is one thing, and notes of its debates are another. Madison himself never confuses the two. He calls his record notes of the debates, and when he says "See the Journal" we know what he means, — the Journal proper, as printed in 1819.

Mr. Hunt's text, in excellent clear type, follows Madison's manuscript, whereas Gilpin used a copy. He avoids with skill and care the difficulties presented by Madison's interlineations and erasures, and gives us a plain and satisfactory text. He indicates the votes in the manner followed by Madison. He gives four facsimiles, two of pages of Madison's manuscript, one of the document which Charles Pinckney sent to Secretary Adams in 1818 as his draft offered to the Convention on May 29, and another of the letter with which Pinckney accompanied it. Mr. Hunt furthers the process of discrediting that document by showing that it is in a hand precisely resembling that of the letter, and written on the same paper, paper bearing the water-mark of 1797 ! The document being notoriously unauthentic and worthless, one cannot see why Mr. Hunt gives it a new lease of life and further opportunities to mislead students by printing it in his text, especially as it forms really no part of Madison's notes. One's regret at its inclusion must, I think, be increased by my discovery of large parts of the genuine Pinckney plan, set forth on a preceding page of this issue of the REVIEW.

Mr. Hunt adds greatly to the interest and value of this edition by printing in foot-notes the records of the debates made by Yates, King, and Pierce whenever they are at variance with Madison's. He also gives us Major Pierce's characterizations of the members, first printed in this journal (Vol. III., 310-334), two letters of Grayson, two of Carrington, two of Charles Pinckney, and one of Hamilton. Otherwise the notes, except Madison's own, are very few ; not more than half a dozen in the whole volume.

Though the edition is so good, and likely to be so useful, it is not improper to mention a few slight errors. It is stated on the first page of the preface that Madison, to carry out his purpose of careful reporting, "took a seat in front of the presiding officer, facing the members," etc. Nothing warrants the assertion that he sat facing the members, and it is highly improbable ; we may be sure that he would have thought it unbecoming for him to assume such a position. His own words are simply that he "chose a seat in front of the presiding member, with the other members on my right and left hands" (II. 410, of this edition). It is stated (p. xiv) that the notes of Madison, Yates, Pierce, and King are the only ones now extant. Notes by Paterson survive. Some of them are before me as I write, and will be printed in the REVIEW. Is it certain that those of Major William Jackson, the secretary, are no longer in

existence? He told John Quincy Adams in 1818 (*Memoirs*, IV. 175) that he had taken extensive minutes. In 1878 they are said to be non-existent; in 1888 we are assured that they are extant. P. xvi, for "Wingaw" read "Winyaw." It is an error to say (p. 25 n.) that Pinckney's letter of December 30, 1818, is printed in the *Documentary History*, at least in any edition known to me; and "some" should read "none" in the statement attributed to Chief Justice Nott as to the preservation of Pinckney's notes.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

The Territorial Growth of the United States. By WILLIAM A. MOWRY. (New York: Silver, Burdett, and Co. 1902. Pp. 237.)

THERE are two phases to the expansion of the United States — the circumstances that have at different times created a demand for more territory, and the efforts of government to meet this demand. Dr. Mowry regards our territorial acquisitions as a series of special providences and upon this theory contents himself with the externals of negotiation without making any attempt to present the underlying causes. Even his statement of the externals is far from satisfactory. He gives no adequate account of the situation that caused the cession of Louisiana, and no account at all of the protracted negotiations resulting in the Florida treaty, not even mentioning the prior acts for occupation. In connection with Texas something is said of slavery, but nothing of the other influences that brought about annexation and caused the Mexican War. There is no reference to the internal agitation for Oregon nor to the way in which Oregon was used to offset Texas. Even Alaska did not come wholly out of a clear sky, but in continuation of negotiations, which are not mentioned, that began in 1854, were resumed in 1859, and interrupted by the Civil War. There is no suggestion of American connection with the Hawaiian Revolution of 1893, and the Philippines were "thrust upon us" unsought. From this it follows that the book fails to tell the true story of the territorial growth of the United States. On the one hand, it omits entirely the reckless disregard of the rights of others that has characterized our national expansion and, on the other, it gives no glimpse of the restless energy of the American people to which that expansion is due. The materials are drawn from secondary sources, chiefly from Lyman's *Diplomacy of the United States*, Marbois's *Louisiana*, and Greenhow's *Oregon*. The style of the book is entertaining and its typographical appearance attractive, which make it the more to be regretted that the subject-matter is superficial.

There are some errors of detail. We find the familiar misstatement that the first Virginia charter granted to the London and Plymouth Companies *all* the territory between the thirty-fourth and forty-fifth parallels instead of a statement that to each was granted a tract one hundred miles square, to be located within the limits designated. A reference to Mitchell's Map copies a misprint in Lyman that misspells the name. Ly-